

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 5-6, and 9-10 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 6 being the independent claims. By the foregoing amendment, claims 1 and 6 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,532,637 to Khoury in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,628,518 to Chadwick. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The office action admits that Khoury does not teach reducing flicker noise, and relies upon Chadwick for this feature. Upon review, Chadwick uses a low pass filter 4 to selectively reject flicker noise that is generated by the mixer 2 from reaching the next stage. (See, Chadwick, FIG. 2). In other words, an extra component (filter 4) is added to the output of the mixer 2 to reflect flicker noise that is generated in the mixer 2.

Whereas, Applicant's claimed mixer adjusts DC current sources that are integral to the mixer so as to prevent or reduce the generation of flicker noise *at the source* (i.e., inside the mixer). There is no need to add *external* components to address the flicker noise after the fact in Applicant's configuration. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that *said DC current adjusted so as to reduce flicker noise being generated inside the mixer*

circuit, as opposed to simply reflecting flicker noise with an added component (e.g., filter) after the noise is generated, as recited in the art. Claim 6 was similarly amended.

Based on the above discussion and amendments, Applicant asserts that the cited art does not teach the combination of features recited in claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn and that these claims be passed to allowance. Dependent claims 5 and 9-10 are patentable over the cited art for the reasons mentioned above, in addition to their own respective patentable features.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jeffrey T. Helvey
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,757

Date: 8/4/05

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

JTH/JH /agj
427560_1.DOC